

Docket AUS920000510US1

Appl. No.: 09/736,349
Filing Date: December 14, 2000**In the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

In re the application of: Brodsky)
)
)
 Filed: 12/14/2000) Group Art Unit: 2153
)
 For: Method Apparatus and) Examiner: Scott M. Klinger
 Computer Program Product)
 to Crawl a Web Site)
)
 Application No. 09/736,349)
)
 Applicant's Docket:)
 AUS920000510US1)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 22 2005**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile
to the United States Patent Office on the date indicated by my signature below.

*Anthony V.S. England*Anthony V.S. England3-22-2005

Date

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

This is to summarize an interview between Examiner Klinger and Attorney England on March 22, 2005.

The Examiner and Attorney discussed by telephone the second Office action, dated February 24, 2005, finally rejecting all remaining claims and citing additional references, "Crawler-Friendly Web Servers" September 2000, ("Brandman") and U.S. Patent No. 6,735,169 ("Albert").

Examiner clarified that Brandman is relied upon in the rejection of claim 1 in the present case for its teaching about a server dynamically generating a web page in response to a crawler requesting the page. Attorney contends that this does not teach that when a reference in a web page is specified by a script to produce an address for a next page the address is determined for the next page by the browser executing the reference and sending the address to the crawler, as claimed, particularly since a browser is something on the client.

Docket AUS920000510US1

Appl. No.: 09/736,349
Filing Date: December 14, 2000

Also, Attorney pointed out that this executing of a reference on a web page to obtain the referenced address of another page is enabled by parsing the reference from one of the web pages by the crawler program and sending the reference to an applet running in the browser, as claimed, and since the applet is running in the browser this is also on the client.

Attorney pointed out that this executing of a reference on a web page to obtain the referenced address of another page is also enabled by a spoof proxy feature of the invention set out in claim 2, for example. Examiner indicated that he is relying on the forwarding agent interposed between the client and host in Albert as shown in FIG's 3A, 3B and 3C for the rejection of claim 2. Attorney pointed out that Albert does not teach about a resolver file on the client that has an address for the host which is different than the actual address of the host, as claimed. This spoofing of the address as described in claim 2 of the present case enables the applet running in the browser to execute the reference, as described in claim 1. That is, security constraints for browsers ordinarily would prevent the applet to execute a reference if the applet did not come from the host that sourced the web page having the reference.

The Examiner said he is considering allowing claims 6 and 7, and their counterparts.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony V. S. England
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,129
512-477-7165
a@aengland.com